

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figure 13. These two sheets replace the original sheet including Figure 13.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the Office Action dated July 28, 2007. Claims 6, 11, 12, 15, 20 and 22-27 have been amended, claims 14 and 21 have been cancelled and new claims 28-34 have been added. No new matter has been added by these amendments or new claims. Applicant has filed a Petition for Revival for Unintentional Abandonment with this Response. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account 02-1818 for any fees which are due and owing in connection with this Response.

Objections to the Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) asserting that: *at least three groups ... unique combination of radial distances ... and angular positions* (clms. 6, 11) must be shown or the feature(s) cancelled from the claim(s). Applicant respectfully submits two sheets of corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) to replace the original sheet including Figure 13.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 6, 11, 12, 14-17, 19, 21-24 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rice et al. US 4,884,604 (“Rice”) in view of Ferdinand et al. US 4,484,608 (“Ferdinand”). Applicant refers to previously presented claims 6, 11, 12, 14-17, 19, 21-24 and 26 as “Prior Claims”.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with and traverses this rejection because Rice and Ferdinand are directed to devices having different modes of operation. In Rice, a router is mounted on the *back side* (relative to platform 12) of plate 24 and has a working bit 32 projecting through an opening in the plate to the opposite side. See, Rice, col. 2, lines 36-41. In contrast, the emphasis of Ferdinand is drawn to a device to receive and support a portable router mounted for vertical movement *above* a work table. See, Ferdinand, col. 2, lines 3-6 and 21-31. For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that Rice and Ferdinand do not render obvious the Prior Claims or their dependent claims.

Nonetheless, Applicant has amended claims 6, 11, 12, 15, 20 and 22-27 of the Prior Claims for clarity and to advance the prosecution of this application. Applicant also canceled

claims 14 and 21 and submitted new claims 28-34 for purposes of increasing the clarity of the claim language.

Amended independent claim 6 recites, among other elements: “a router table configured to mount a router to the bottom side of the table top, the table top defining: (i) a router bit hole extending through the table top; (ii) a first group of router mounting holes positioned adjacent to the router bit hole, each one of the router mounting holes of the first group having a distance from the router bit hole; and (iii) a second group of router mounting holes positioned adjacent to the router bit hole, each one of the router mounting holes of the second group having a distance from the router bit hole, at least one of the distances of the first group being different from at least one of the distances of the second group.”

Amended independent claim 11 recites, among other elements: “an assembly comprising a router table and an adapter router mounting plate configured to be connected to the bottom side of the table top adjacent to the table router bit hole.”

At least for the reasons set forth above, Applicant submits that neither Rice nor Ferdinand disclose such elements. Accordingly, Applicant submits that amended independent claims 6 and 11 and their dependent claims are patentably distinguished over the proposed combination and in condition for allowance.

Claims 18 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rice in view of Ferdinand and further in view of Jaksha US 5,367,933 (“Jaksha”). For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to amended independent claims 6 and 11, Applicant respectfully submits that the proposed combination of Rice, Ferdinand and Jaksha does not render obvious dependent claims 18 and 25, which depend from one of amended independent claims 6 and 11. Accordingly, dependent claims 18 and 25 are patentably distinguished over the proposed combination and in condition for allowance.

The Office Action also rejected claims 20 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rice in view of Ferdinand and further in view of Fukuda US 5,868,188 (“Fukuda”). For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to amended independent claims 6 and 11, Applicant respectfully submits that the proposed combination of Rice, Ferdinand and Fukuda does not render obvious dependent claims 20 and 27, which depend from one of

amended independent claims 6 and 11. Accordingly, dependent claims 20 and 27 are patentably distinguished over the proposed combination and in condition for allowance.

New independent claim 28 recites, among other elements: "an assembly comprising a router table and an adapter router mounting plate configured to be connected to the bottom side of the table top adjacent to the table router bit hole." For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to amended independent claims 6 and 11, Applicant respectfully submits that new independent claim 28 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art of record and in condition for allowance.

An earnest endeavor has been made to place this application in condition for allowance, and such allowance is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any questions related to this Response, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLP

BY 

Renato L. Smith

Reg. No. 45,117

Customer No. 24573

Dated: October 19, 2007